



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,823	07/22/2003	Alastair McIndoe Hodges	LFSCAN.60C2C2	6567

7590 11/21/2006

BERNARD E. SHAY
JOHNSON & JOHNSON, INTERNATIONAL PATENT LAW DIV.,
P.O. BOX 1222
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08903

EXAMINER

NOGUEROLA, ALEXANDER STEPHAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1753

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Xiix to try to clarify the argument set forth at the bottom of page 4 bridging to 5 of the response of September 11, 2006. In particular the examiner did not understand how a Cottrell measurement at 0.1 mm electrode spacing (i_d) that is 20% more than a Cottrell current at 1 mm electrode spacing shows the prior art combination used in the rejection to be inoperable or largely inaccurate. Mr. Xiix explained that " i_d " is the current that will be obtained with Applicant's invention and thus the cited combination of prior art references, but " i_c " is the current predicted by Pottgen based on the Cottrell equation. The reference to 1 mm spacing on page 5 of the Response should be ignored as in his view it will be the same at 0.1mm electrode spacing. That is, the Cottrell equation is independent of electrode distance. Mr. Xiix also commented that he does not believe the electrodes in Figures 3 and 4 of Pottgen are facing each other. They, in his view, actually function similar to the coplanar electrodes in Figure 9. Thus, in his view, the reference to having the electrodes only spaced 0.1mm apart to have Cottrell behavior in column 07 does not apply to electrodes that face each other. The examiner told Mr. Xiix that he made good points, but they would require further elaboration and support in a followup response to be persuasive.